Land Development Code Advisory Group
Meeting #24 Minutes

September 22, 2014 at 4:00 pm
Ruiz Branch Library
1600 Grove Blvd., Austin, Texas 78741

Members in attendance: Jim Duncan, Stephen Delgado, Melissa Neslund, Jeff Jack, Will Herring, Dave Sullivan, Stephen Oliver.

Members Absent: Brian Reis, Beverly Silas, Mandy De Mayo.

Meeting Objective: Review Approach Alternatives & Annotated Outlines, and discuss form-based codes. The Advisory Group may vote on a resolution on any agenda item.

1. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from September 3 meeting adopted by consensus; minutes from August 18 meeting not adopted.

2. Review Approach Alternatives & Annotated Outlines report: Dan Parolek of Opticos Design presented the Code Approach Alternatives & Annotated Outlines report as well as the upcoming CodeNEXT schedule. Discussion included education efforts required for the future 10-1 Council; new base zone districts; a comprehensive approach to mapping new districts; coordination of CodeNEXT with the Zucker Systems analysis; how by-right review is administered; importance of intent statements throughout sections of the code; coordination that is required for a hybrid code to be effective; how the Envision Tomorrow tool will be utilized in phase two of CodeNEXT.

3. Introduction of the concept of form-based codes: Dan Parolek made a presentation on form-based codes and their relation to Community Character in a Box and the Community Character Manual. He explained that the goal of form-based codes is predictability and clarity, and that the intent needs to be identified. He emphasized CodeNEXT's desires and efforts to provide the right tools to maintain the unique characteristics of Austin neighborhoods. Discussion addressed future code amendments; economic analysis and benefits; that form-based coding does not mean up-zoning; future decisions regarding when the degree of change is determined for different areas.

4. Presentation on Planned Unit Development (PUD) case study: Jim Duncan presented a case study of the Austin Oaks Planned Unit Development (PUD). He felt there were discrepancies in the current development review process for PUDs, and explained that PUDs are a helpful tool when they are used correctly.

5. Standing Items:
    a. Discuss structure and organization of Advisory Group
        - Consider selecting an individual to fill a vacancy:
       Advisory group members provided suggestions to fill the vacant spot.   Suggestions included: Nuria Zaragoza, an ANC Executive Committee member, Ed Wendler, Brennan Griffin, and Steve Aleman. The group decided to ask potential new members to compose a letter to the group regarding their expertise and what constituency they would be representing.
    b. Discuss work product type and goals for Advisory Group
       Milestone document distributed. Edits will be made before the next meeting.
    c. Update from members on their outreach activities. Members reported on their activities.
    d. Report from Working Group on Envision Tomorrow. None.
    e. Agenda items to consider for next meeting (October 6 public comment meeting; October 20 regular meeting)
       Suggested items for the October 20 meeting included: recommendation of a new advisory group member, presentation by Eleanor McKinney, and a conversation about how neighborhood plans will be respected.

6. Public comment: We need a code that will support the primary objective of Imagine Austin, to grow in a different way and stop vast sprawl; support for approach 3; Real Estate Council of Austin supports approach 3; request for intent statements of the current land development code; request for Dan Parolek's presentations to be available to the public; the report contains too much jargon; mapping is important to neighborhoods and should be developed by Opticos; suggested adjustment of development standards in order to make by-right review and performance-based standards high; neighborhood plans should be adjusted to new base zones; approach 2 leaves too much to chance; concern that approach 2 does not implement Imagine Austin indicators quickly; Complete Streets policy should be coordinated with CodeNEXT; new code should be prototyped on a few neighborhoods across the city; inquiry for how neighborhoods can adopt walkable urban contexts in the future if they chose to.

7. CodeNEXT Team response to public comment: Presentations will be available on the CodeNEXT website; Complete Streets is being coordinate with CodeNEXT; missing middle conversations will continue moving forward; hot button issues will be addressed regardless of which approach is selected; CodeNEXT Team will increase efforts toward defining terms and using as little jargon as possible.

Meeting adjourned at 6:20pm